REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-45 are pending. Claims 1-45 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 17, 21, 24, 26, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Claims 1-20 and 30-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to include <u>setting up the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system</u> according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information found in at least one of the plurality of locations.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim1, as amended, is now allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Given that amended independent claims 11, 17, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 contain similar limitations, applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 11, 17, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Given that claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-20, 31, 33, 35-37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 depend from amended claims 1, 11, 17, 30, 32, 34, 38, 40, 42, and 44 respectively, and add

additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-20, 31, 33, 35-37, 39, 41, 43, and 45 are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, 21-24, 32-33 and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,885 B2 to Norris, et al. ("Norris").

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include automatically searching in a plurality of locations for a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to set up the software; and setting up the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information found, through a search, in at least one of the plurality of locations.

Norris, in contrast, discloses a mechanism for automatically securing licensing for unlicensed codec. More specifically, Norris discloses

A method for licensing codecs in accordance with the invention includes initiating a call from a first endpoint, the first endpoint identifying a preferred codec, receiving the call at a second endpoint wherein a licensed copy of the preferred codec is not included, and generating a codec license request from the second endpoint to the first endpoint and/or at least one third party codec provider.

(Norris, Abstract) (emphasis added)

Further, Norris discloses

"... third party provider(s) 140 first provide a copy of the preferred codec to endpoint 120 and then generate a codec license grant for transmission to endpoint 120. Alternatively, for example, such a transaction may be accomplished by endpoint 100 providing the codec and the license grant or both endpoint 100 and third party provider(s) 140 providing the codec and the license grant."

(Norris, col. 3, line 17-24) (emphasis added)

Thus, Norris merely discloses generating a license request for an unlicensed codec, and receiving the codec and the license grant, in contrast to setting up the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration

information found, through a search, in at least one of the plurality of locations, as recited in amended claim 1. There are no such parameters in Norris, and there is no such search in Norris.

Because Norris fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by Norris.

Given that claims 4, 6-10, 21-24, 32-33, and 40-41 contain related limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 6-10, 21-24, 32-33, and 40-41 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by Norris.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 11-20, 25-31, 34-39, and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Norris in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,807,558 B1 to Hassett et al. ("Hassett").

It is respectfully submitted that neither Norris, nor Hassett discloses automatically searching in a plurality of locations for a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to set up the software; and setting up the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information found in at least one of the plurality of locations, as recited in amended claim 1.

Norris, as set forth above, discloses generating a license request for an unlicensed codec, and receiving the codec and the license grant.

Hassett, in contrast, discloses a "push" technology to distribute information. There is no need to perform automatic search when a "push" technology is used.

It is respectfully submitted that Norris does not teach or suggest a combination with Hassett, and Hassett does not teach or suggest a combination with Norris. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants own disclosure, to incorporate the licensing of codec of Norris into broadcasting of the information of Hassett. Moreover, even if Norris and Hassett were combined, such a combination would still lack automatically searching in a plurality of locations <u>for a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to set up the software</u>; and <u>setting up the software installed on the storage device of the data processing system for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information</u> found in at least one of the plurality of locations, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2, 3, 5, 17-20, 25, 30-31, 38-39, 44-45 contain related limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2, 3, 5, 17-20, 25, 30-31, 38-39, 44-45 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Hassett.

It is respectfully submitted that neither Norris, nor Hassett discloses <u>querying a directory server to obtain a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to set up the software</u>; and <u>setting up the software for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information</u> obtained from the directory server, as recited in amended claim 11.

Norris, as set forth above, discloses generating a license request for an unlicensed codec, and receiving the codec and the license grant.

Hassett, in contrast, discloses a "push" technology to distribute information. There is no need to query when a "push" technology is used.

It is respectfully submitted that Norris does not teach or suggest a combination with Hassett, and Hassett does not teach or suggest a combination with Norris. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on applicants own disclosure, to incorporate the

licensing of codec of Norris into broadcasting of the information of Hassett. Moreover, even if Norris and Hassett were combined, such a combination would still lack querying a directory server to obtain a configuration information that includes one or more parameters to set up the software; and setting up the software for operation of the data processing system according to the one or more parameters contained in the configuration information obtained from the directory server, as recited in amended claim 11.

Given that claims 12-16, 26-29, 34-37, and 42-43 contain related limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-16, 26-29, 34-37, and 42-43 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Norris in view of Hassett.

Claim 4 has been amended to include that the automatically searching is in response to installing the software.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses such limitations of amended claim 4.

Claim 24 has been amended to include that the automatically searching is in response to installing the software.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the references cited by the Examiner discloses such limitations of amended claim 24.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: July 9, 2007

James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300
Fax (408) 720-8383